

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 5 and 11 are cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-21 are pending. Claims 1 and 10 are amended, and claim 21 is added. Claims 1, 10 and 21 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 5 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten to in independent form. In response,

independent claim 21 has been added to combine the allowable subject matter of objected-to claim 5 and independent claim 1;

independent claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of objected-to claim 11; and

independent claim 1 has been amended to include a novel combination of elements not taught or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 10, and 21 are in condition for allowance.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is advised that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed on June 8, 2005. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge this IDS in the next official communication.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (U.S. 2005/0166882-A1).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 10, and 21

First of all, as noted above, and while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection,

independent claim 21 has been added to combine the allowable subject matter of objected-to claim 5 and independent claim 1; and

independent claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of objected-to claim 11.

Thus, independent claims 21 and 10 are in condition for allowance

In addition, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a ground structure for a vehicle, including *inter alia*

“a first cable extending from a body frame of the vehicle body to the engine for grounding said engine” and

“wherein said first cable has a wire diameter set substantially equal to any of the plurality of other cables wired to said engine and any of the plurality of cables wired to a part coupled to said engine”.

The novel features set forth in independent claim 1 can be seen in FIGS. 1-3, for example. Paragraphs [0003] and [0004] of the specification describe examples of the conventional art, in which multiple cables are used to ground the battery. The present inventors conceived and reduced to practice the present invention to address the problem and cost in the conventional art of having multiple grounding cables for the battery.

In contrast to the present invention of independent claim 1, the Suzuki document appears to disclose an engine ground system with intermediate positions on a ground wire having multiple sections electrically connected to ground points of the engine, and the other end of the ground wire is grounded to the vehicle body, wherein the ground points are on the cylinder head of the engine. However, the Suzuki specification fails to mention anything about the wire diameter, and Suzuki FIG. 1 seems to indicate that diameters of the cables are equal. Thus, Suzuki fails to suggest the invention set forth in independent claims 1. The grounding cables of Suzuki include cables with redundant cable diameters, which are heavy and would increase the cost in comparison with the presently claimed grounding cable arrangement.

Independent claim 1 also sets forth

“plurality of other cables, including a second cable which directly connects a battery to the engine, a negative terminal of the battery being grounded solely by being directly connected to the engine, the engine being grounded to the body frame by the first cable”

Further, in contrast to the present invention as set forth in independent claim 1, Suzuki et al. merely disclose a grounding structure in which the battery is grounded by two cables 10, 11, one cable 11 connected directly to the strut 1b, and a second cable 10 directly connected to the throttle 7, and then continuing on to the engine 2.

Further, there is no motivation suggested in these references or the conventional art to reduce the number of cables used to ground the battery to one cable.

As such, Suzuki et al. cannot teach or suggest the invention as set forth in claim 1.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1, 10, and 21 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Suzuki et al.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 10, and 21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

For example, dependent claims 18 and 20 recite “grounding of the battery and any other electric parts is integrated into the one of the other cables that connects the battery to the engine”.

Support for the features included in claims 18 and 20 can be found for example, in paragraph [00020], which recites “ground cables for all electric parts (including sensors and switches) are integrated in the feedback ground cable C4”. As can be seen in FIG. 1 of Suzuki et al., this document provide not hint whatsoever of “grounding of the battery and any other electric parts is integrated into the one of the other cables that connects the battery to the engine”, as set forth in claims 18 and 20.

All claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

Application No. 10/617,049
Amendment dated March 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 15, 2005



Docket No. 0505-1211P
Art Unit: 3747
Page 13 of 13

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Date: March 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
 James M. Slattery, #28,380
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JMS/CTT/ags